

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 23-30 are pending. Claims 4-5 and 17-22 have been cancelled.

Reconsideration of the Application and Claims is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ozkan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,074) in view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,419). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention that are set forth in Claims 1-3, 6-16 and 30 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al.

Claim 1 is drawn to a digital television receiving system and a method of sharing information. Independent Claim 1 is reproduced below in its entirety for the convenience of the Examiner:

1. (Currently Amended) In a digital television receiving system, a method of sharing information comprising the steps of:
 - a) a first device receiving a digital television bit-stream;
 - b) a second device setting a value in an attribute field of a command, said command for requesting a table of a plurality of tables regarding said bit-stream and wherein said value in the attribute field refines identification of said table being requested;
 - c) said second device setting at least one flag of a plurality of flags in said command, said step of setting defining the type of table said attribute field describes, wherein the type of table said attribute field describes is selectable between multiple types of tables;
 - d) said second device issuing said command to said first device;
 - and
 - e) said first device responsive to said value of said flag of said command and said value in said attribute field, returning one table of said plurality of tables to said second device.

Claim 11 contains limitations similar to those contained in Claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 6-10 and 30 depend from independent Claim 1 and set forth additional limitations of the present invention. Claims 12-16 depend from independent Claim 1 and set forth additional limitations of the present invention.

Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention that are set forth in Claims 1 and 11. Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al. is deficient as the primary reference Ozkan et al. does not teach all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 11 and the secondary reference Humpleman et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Ozkan et al. In particular, Ozkan et al. does not teach or suggest in a digital television receiving system that includes a first and a second device “said second device issuing said command to said first device; and e) said first device . . . returning one table of said plurality of tables to said second device” as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations). And, Humpleman et al. does not teach or suggest these limitations to remedy the deficiencies of Ozkan et al.

Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations) sets forth a receiving system wherein: (1) a first device receives a television bit stream, (2) a second device configures a command related to the bit stream that is issued to the first device, and (3) the first device responds to the command by returning one of a plurality of tables to the second device. In the Office Action, column 3, lines 47-52 and column 5, lines 35-62 as are referenced as containing subject matter that teaches the aforementioned limitations of Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations).

Therein, the recited interaction between the first and second device (issuing of a table by the second device in response to a command received from the first device) is equated with the function of processor 60 (disclosed in Ozkan et al.) in configuring components 13, 15 and 17 and in setting control register values. However, the equating of these elements as is proposed is contradicted by subject matter that is disclosed by Ozkan et al. at column 4, lines 3-15, wherein Ozkan et al. discloses that processor 60 itself assembles information into tables and thus does not receive the tables from another component in response to commands that it sends to it as is required to meet the aforementioned limitations of Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations); see also column 6, lines 5-10. Applicant respectfully, submits that nowhere in the Ozkan et al. reference is a digital television receiving system that includes a first and a second device “said second device issuing said command to said first device; and e) said first device . . . returning one table of said plurality of tables to said second device” taught or suggested as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations).

Humpleman et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Ozkan et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of Ozkan et al. noted above. In particular, Humpleman et al. does not teach or suggest a digital television receiving system that includes a first and a second device “said second device issuing said command to said first device; and e) said first device . . . returning one table of said plurality of tables to said second device” as is set forth in Claim 1 (Claim 11 contains similar limitations). Humpleman et al. shows a very dissimilar method and apparatus for user and device command and control. It should be noted that Humpleman et al. is not employed by the Examiner to address the aforementioned deficiency of Ozkan et al. (see discussion below). Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the

Humpleman et al. reference is a digital television receiving system that includes a first and a second device where the second device issues a command to a first device and the first device returns one table of a plurality of tables to the second device as is set forth in Claims 1 and 11 taught or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of Applicant's invention as are set forth in Claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al.

As Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al. possesses the deficiencies that are outlined above. Applicant respectfully submits that Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are recited in Claims 1 and 11, and as such, Claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Ozkan et al. in view of Humpleman et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are recited in Claims 2-3, 6-10 and 30 dependent on Claim 1, and Claims 12-16 dependent on Claim 11, and that these Claims overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,074. The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention that are set forth in Claims 23-29 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ozkan et al.

Claim 23 is drawn to a digital television receiving system and a method of providing bitstream information. Independent Claim 23 is reproduced below in its entirety for the convenience of the Examiner:

23. In a digital television receiving system, a method of providing bitstream information, said method comprising:
accessing a digital television bit-stream;
accessing a command requesting a table describing information in said digital television bit-stream, said command comprising:
a plurality of attribute fields comprising:
a table field for specifying a table identifier; and
a multi-purpose field for specifying one of a plurality of attributes related to a requested table; and
a flag field for specifying which one of the plurality of attributes said multi-purpose field holds;
determining if said flag field indicates a rating region table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said rating region table;
determining if said flag field indicates an event table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said event table; and
determining if said flag field indicates an extended text table is requested, and if so, using information in said multi-purpose field to provide said extended text table.

Claims 24-29 depend from independent Claim 23 and recite additional limitations of the present invention.

Ozkan et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention that is set forth in Claim 23. A deficiency of Ozkan et al. is that Ozkan et al. does not teach each of the limitations of Claim 23. In particular, Ozkan et al. does not teach or suggest: (1) accessing a digital television bit-stream, (2) accessing a command requesting a

table describing information in said digital television bit-stream, and (3) using information in said multi-purpose field to provide an extended text table, as is required to meet the limitations of Claim 23. In the Office Action, column 3, lines 47-52 and column 5, lines 35-62 is referenced as containing subject matter that teaches the aforementioned limitations of Claim 23.

In the Office Action, operations recited in Claim 23 (the issuing of a table by the second device in response to a command received from the first device) are equated to the function of processor 60 (disclosed in Ozkan et al.) in configuring components 13, 15 and 17 and in setting control register values. Moreover, in the Office Action, in order to meet the limitations of Claim 23, processor 60 is characterized as being provided a table in response to a command that it issues.

However, this characterization of the operation of processor 60 is contradicted by subject matter that is disclosed by Ozkan et al. At column 4, lines 3-15, Ozkan et al. discloses that processor 60 itself assembles information into tables and thus does not receive the tables from another component in response to commands that it sends to another component as is required to meet the aforementioned limitations of Claim 23. Consequently, Ozkan et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention that is set forth in Claim 23.

As Ozkan et al. possesses the deficiencies that are outlined above. Applicant respectfully submits that Ozkan et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is set forth in Claim 23, and as such, Claim 23 is in condition for

allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Ozkan et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present claimed invention as are recited in Claims 24-29 dependent on Claim 23, and that Claims 24-29 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending Claims overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of the pending Claims is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.


Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 6/28, 2006

Address:

Telephone:



Anthony C. Murabito
Registration No. 35,295
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile